DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 527 UD 028 283

TITLE Atlanta Public Schools Peer Leadership Connection Report 1989-90. Report No. 11, Vol. 25.
INSTITUTION Atlanta Public Schools, GA. Div. of Research, Evaluation, and Data Processing.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure; Attendance Patterns; Behavior Change; Comparative Analysis; *Grade 8; *High School Students; *Junior High School Students; *Mentors; Nontraditional Education; Peer Influence; *Peer Relationship; Peer Teaching; Program Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Student Leadership; Traditional Schools; Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS *Atlanta Public Schools GA

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of a peer leadership program connecting senior high school students with at-risk, new eighth-graders in seven Atlanta (Georgia) high schools is evaluated. The program trains the peer leaders in leadership and group dynamics and then places pairs of leaders with 10 or 12 advisees for weekly meetings. The study population includes 102 peer leaders and 498 student advisees for a total of 600 students. Study participants attended four regular high schools and three alternative high schools. In addition, for control groups, two regular and two alternative schools are included, for a total control group of 646 students. For regular high schools, the absence data and course failure data favor the peer leadership group of both advisees and peer leaders over the control group. On the other hand, the attendance data and course failure data for the alternative schools favor the control group over the program participants. Statistical data are presented in six tables. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337527

Atlanta Public Schools
Peer Leadership Connection Report
1989-90

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30335

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. M. Taylor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

REPORT NO. 11, VOL. 25,12/90

VD # 028 283

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Atlanta Public Schools
Peer Leadership Connection Report
1989-90

Prepared by
Linda Ballagas
Department of Research and Evaluation

Dr. Lester W. Butts
Superintendent

Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Georgia
December 1990

Board of Education of the City of Atlanta

	Educational District
Ms. Midge Sweet	1
Dr. Preston W. Williams	2
Mr. Joseph G. Martin, Jr., President	3
Mr. John Elger	4
Dr. D. F. Glover	5
Mr. Robert Waymer	6
Rev. Mary Anne Bellinger, Vice President	At Large
Mrs. Ina Evans	At Large
Mrs. Carolyn D. Yancey	At large

Atlanta Public Schools
Peer Leadership Connection Report
Abstract
1989-90

The Atlanta Peer Leadership Connection is a program that began in several Atlanta secondary schools in 1989-90. A major objective of the program is to strengthen problem-solving and leadership skills of selected high school students. A cadre of upperclassmen (usually seniors) in each school was selected to be Peer Leaders and received intensive training related to leadership roles and group dynamics. Another major objective of the program is to assist students new to the school (usually entry-level students, i.e., eighth or ninth graders) in their social and academic adjustment to the setting. Peer Leaders were paired in groups of two with ten or twelve student advisees (new students) to provide extensive support for these new students The model calls for Peer Leaders to be enrolled in a year-long, credit-bearing leadership course and for the Peer Leaders to meet on a weekly basis with their advisee group. The project was supported by the Coca-Cola Foundation. Training and ongoing technical assistance has been provided to the Peer Leaders, as well as faculty advisors, by Dr. Sharon Powell of the Princeton Center for Leadership Training, developer of the Peer Leadership Connection Model.

The targeted regular high schools were Archer, Douglass, Turner and West Fulton. The participating alternative high schools were North Avenue Academy, Rich's Academy, and West End Academy. The targeted grade levels were eighth and ninth grades (for student advisees) and twelfth grade (for Peer Leaders). The number of students impacted were 102 Peer Leaders and 498 student advisees for a total of 600 students.

Student absence data and course failure data for first and second semesters tend to favor participants in the Peer Leadership Program over the control group in the regular high schools. In the alternative high schools, though, student absence data and course failure data did not favor participants in Peer Leadership over a control group.

R&E
LB:aap

Atlanta Public Schools
Peer Leadership Connection Report
1989-90

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Background 1

Method 1

Results 3

Discussion 5

Conclusions 5

Appendix

Table 1 6
Number of Program Participants and Control Group Students by Grade at Regular High Schools, 1989-90

Table 2 7
Number of Program Participants and Control Group Students by Grade at Alternative Schools, 1989-90

Table 3 8
Comparison of Student Attendance for Program Participants and a Control Group at Regular High Schools, 1989-90

Table 4 9
Comparison of Student Attendance for Program Participants and a Control Group at Alternative High Schools, 1989-90

Table 5 10
Comparison of Number of Courses Failed for Program Participants and a Control Group at Regular High Schools, 1989-90

Table 6 11
Comparison of Number of Courses Failed for Program Participants and a Control Group at Alternative High Schools, 1989-90

ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION

Report on Attendance and Course Failure Data
for Peer Leadership Participants
and Control Groups in Regular and Alternative High Schools
1989-90

Background

The Atlanta Peer Leadership Connection began operation in the 1989-90 school year in four regular Atlanta High schools and three alternative high schools. There is a two-pronged purpose of the program: 1) to develop problem-solving and leadership skills among identified seniors (Peer Leaders) and 2) to facilitate the adjustment of first-year high school students (advisees) to their new environment.

Dr. Sharon Powell, of the Princeton Center for Leadership Training, developed this training program and has been intimately involved in the training provided in Atlanta. She has reported that participation in this program should result in a number of behavior changes in students that can be observed. Peer Leaders can be expected to 1) exhibit increased confidence, 2) speak up more often, 3) demonstrate a greater willingness to take on different roles, 4) show more initiative, 5) manage conflict more effectively, 6) be more inquisitive, 7) demonstrate increased motivation, 8) be more responsible, 9) demonstrate improved rapport with teachers, and 10) show a greater appreciation for teachers. Advisees (new students) can be expected to 1) be happier, 2) have a greater sense of belonging, 3) speak up more, 4) be more motivated, 5) feel more "connected," 6) not feel isolated, 7) have more fun, 8) feel a part of the "family," and 9) have a decrease in discipline problems.

The Peer Leadership model calls for Peer Leaders to be enrolled in a year-long course to learn skills related to leadership and group dynamics. The advisees (new students) meet in groups of 10-12 with two Peer Leaders once per week. During the sessions the groups employ problem-solving and group cohesion techniques to develop peer relations and promote adjustment to high school.

Method

Program Participants and Control Students

Peer Leadership Connection was identified for implementation at seven sites which included four regular high schools and three alternative high schools. The regular high schools were: Archer, Douglass, Turner, and West Fulton. The alternative schools were the following academies: North Avenue, Rich's, and West End. Peer Leaders and advisees were selected by the staff at each site. Peer Leaders, usually seniors, were primarily selected for their potential to lead groups successfully. They did not have to be academically exceptional students, the most popular students at school, or members of the student council. The advisees, usually eighth graders, were to be selected because of their potential to reap the most benefits from the program. These students were those who may be "at-risk," those who were likely to have difficulty adjusting to the new high school environment. It was reported by the external evaluator, however, that the selection of some students had to be determined because of the student's class schedule. The external evaluator

reported in October 1990, that there was an extensive change in the Peer Leaders and advisees at Douglass High, at the beginning of the second semester in January 1990. The original Peer Leadership file was not updated, because this fact was not known by the Atlanta Public Schools researcher until after the data analysis was completed.

In November 1989, the names of students who were identified as Peer Leaders and advisees at each site were collected. A central computer file was created and some preliminary attendance data was compiled for the first forty days of school and the first eighty days of school in December 1989, and January 1990.

Four control schools were identified to allow for some preliminary comparisons of data trends. Two regular high schools, Harper and Washington, were selected as controls for the regular Peer Leadership high schools. These two schools were selected because all of the regular Peer Leadership schools encompassed grades 8-12. These were the only two other Atlanta high schools that had an eighth grade. Two alternative high schools, Central Academy and St. Luke's Academy, were selected because these were the two remaining Exodus schools.

Neither the Peer Leadership schools nor the participants (Peer Leaders and advisees) were randomly selected for this program. The control schools were also not randomly selected. However, within the control schools, a random selection of 16 seniors at each regular control high school and 10 seniors at each alternative school was made to identify control Peer Leaders. At the regular control high schools all eighth grade students were selected as control advisees. At the control alternative schools all students not selected as Peer Leaders were identified as control advisees, simulating the identification process at Peer Leadership alternative schools. (See Table 1 for an overview of the number of participants, peer leaders and advisees, reported by grade for regular Peer Leadership and control schools.) (See Table 2 for an overview of program participants reported by grade for alternative Peer Leadership and control schools.)

Design

There were a number of variables for which data is automatically collected and stored on central computer files, e.g. grades, standardized test scores, grade point averages, dropout data, suspension data, expulsion data, and attendance. However, two variables were identified by the contracted external program evaluator and central in-house evaluator as being most likely to be affected by participation in the Peer Leadership Program. These variables were school absence and the number of courses failed. More specifically, school absence was defined by the number and percentage of students who were absent "0 days," "1-5 days," "6-10 days" and "11 or more days" for the first five attendance periods and the remaining four attendance periods. Course failure was defined by the number and percentage of students who failed no courses, one course, or two or more courses, at the end of the first and second semesters.

Since students were not randomly selected nor were they randomly assigned to the Peer Leadership Program or a control group, basic requirements to apply tests of statistical significance to the data were not met. Instead, descriptive data were compiled in terms of the number and percentage of students by group (Peer Leaders and advisees), by school type (regular and alternative high schools), and was totaled by Peer Leadership and control schools.

Results

Attendance

Regular High Schools:

Table 3 provides a summary of data regarding student absences for Peer Leadership and control students in regular high schools. The percentages of advisees and Peer Leaders who were absent "0 days" were not as high as the respective percentages for the control group for both the first and second semesters. However, the percentages of advisees and Peer Leaders who were absent "11 or more days" were lower than the percentages for the control groups each semester. The largest percentage of program advisees was found in the category of "1-5 days" of absence for both first and second semester, while the largest percentage of control advisees was reported for the category of "11 or more days" of absence for both the first and second semesters.

The largest percentage of Peer Leaders fell in the category of "1-5 days" of absence for the first semester and "6-10 days" of absence for the second semester. The control Peer Leaders also had the largest percentage of students in the category of "1-5 days" of absence for the first semester. For the second semester an equally high percentage of control Peer Leaders fell into the categories of "1-5 days" of absence and "11 or more days" of absence.

When the two highest categories of days absent were combined, there was a lower percentage of program advisees absent six (6) or more days than the control advisee percentage; 48 percent versus 50 percent during the first semester; and 49 percent versus 54 percent during the second semester. When the two highest categories of days absent were combined, there was a somewhat lower percentage of Peer Leaders absent six (6) or more days than the "control" Peer Leader percentage for the first semester, 42 percent versus 44 percent, respectively. For the second semester there was a substantially higher percentage of Peer Leaders absent six (6) or more days when compared to the control Peer Leaders, 62 percent versus 50 percent.

Alternative Schools:

Table 4 provides a summary of data regarding student absences for Peer Leadership and control students in alternative high schools. The percentages of advisees and Peer Leaders absent "0 days" were less than the respective percentages for the control groups each semester. The percentages of advisees and Peer Leaders absent "11 or more" days exceeded the percentage for the control group each semester, with one exception. The percentage of Peer Leaders absent "11 or more days" in the first semester was lower than the control Peer Leader percentage.

The largest percentage of Peer Leaders and advisees in both the Peer Leadership and control alternative schools for the first and second semester fell in the category of "11 or more days" of absence with one exception. The largest percentage of control Peer Leaders for the second semester was in the category of "0 days" absent.

When the two highest categories of days absent are combined, the percentages of program advisees and Peer Leaders absent six (6) or more days

was higher than the percentages for control advisees and Peer Leaders for both semesters, with one exception. The percentage of first semester Peer Leaders absent 6 or more days was not as high as the percentage for control Peer Leaders. The percentages of students in the alternative schools absent six (6) or more days was as follows:

1st semester advisees	--	79% program vs. 67% control
2nd semester advisees	--	73% program vs. 58% control
1st semester Peer Leaders	--	69% program vs. 81% control
2nd semester Peer Leaders	--	74% program vs. 44% control

Course Data

Regular High Schools:

Table 5 is a summary of course failure data for Peer Leadership and control students in regular high schools. The percentages of program advisees and Peer Leaders who did not fail any courses first and second semesters was higher than the percentages for control advisees and Peer Leaders. The percentages of program advisees and Peer Leaders who failed two or more courses were lower than the percentages for control advisees and Peer Leaders first and second semesters.

The percentage of program advisees and Peer Leaders who failed one course was greater than the corresponding control percentages first semester. For second semester, the percentage of program advisees failing one course exceeded the control advisee percentage, but the percentage of program Peer Leaders who failed one course was lower than the percentage for control Peer Leaders.

Alternative Schools:

Table 6 provides a summary of course failure data for Peer Leadership and control students in alternative high schools. Smaller percentages of program advisees and Peer Leaders did not fail any courses than the percentages for control advisees and Peer Leaders both semesters.

The percentages of program advisees and Peer Leaders failing one course exceeded the percentages for control advisees and Peer Leaders for first semester. Second semester there was a smaller percentage of program advisees failing one course than the percentage for control advisees, but there was a larger percentage of program Peer Leaders failing one course than the percentage for control Peer Leaders.

The percentages of students failing two or more courses was higher among program advisees than control advisees first semester, and higher among program advisees and Peer Leaders than control advisees and Peer Leaders for the second semester. The percentage of first semester Peer Leaders failing two or more courses was lower than the percentage for control Peer Leaders.

The highest percentage of program advisees failed two or more courses both semesters, whereas, the highest percentage of control advisees failed no courses.

The highest percentages of program and control Peer Leaders failed no courses first and second semesters.

Discussion

This data is descriptive in nature, and caution should be used in interpretation, especially since the students, reflected in the Douglass High program, are the original students and perhaps not those involved during the second semester. Some trends are evident from the data.

For the regular high schools, the absence data and course failure data tend to favor the Peer Leadership group, both advisees and Peer Leaders, over the control group. There were lower percentages of students absent "11 or more days" among program participants than among the control group. There were higher percentages of program participants than control students who did not fail any courses and there were lower percentages of program participants than control students who failed two or more courses.

The data trends for the alternative schools are contrary to those of the regular high schools. The attendance data and course failure data tend to favor the control group over the Peer Leadership participants. The control group usually had lower percentages of students absent "11 or more days" and usually had lower percentages of students failing two or more courses. The control group in the alternative schools also had higher percentages of students who did not fail any courses than the alternative school Peer Leadership group. Also, the control group in the alternative schools usually had lower percentages of students failing 2 or more courses than the alternative school Peer Leadership group.

Conclusions

The Peer Leadership Connection should be continued in the regular high schools, but discontinued or extensively reviewed and modified in the alternative schools.

R&E/12/90
LB:jep
#4936-30

APPENDIX

TABLE 1 -- ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION
Number of Program Participants and Control Group Students by Grade at Regular High Schools, 1989-90

Peer Leadership Regular High Schools	Number of Students By Grade					
	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Total
Archer High						
Advisees	67	10	2	0	1	80
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	16	16
Total	67	10	2	0	17	96
Douglass High						
Advisees	39	0	0	0	0	39
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	2	18	20
Total	39	0	0	2	18	59
Turner High						
Advisees	49	0	0	0	0	49
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	16	16
Total	49	0	0	0	16	65
West Fulton High						
Advisees	119	0	0	0	0	119
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	12	12
Total	119	0	0	0	12	131
Peer Leadership Total Regular High						
Advisees	274	10	2	0	1	287
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	2	62	64
Total	274	10	2	2	63	351

Control Regular High Schools	Number of Students By Grade					
	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Total
Harper High						
Advisees	217	0	0	0	0	217
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	16	16
Total	217	0	0	0	16	233
Washington High						
Advisees	161	0	0	0	0	161
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	16	16
Total	161	0	0	0	16	177
Control Total Regular High						
Advisees	378	0	0	0	0	378
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	32	32
Total	378	0	0	0	32	410

R&E/LB:aap/12-90 - #4936-71

TABLE 2 -- ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION
Number of Program Participants and Control Group Students by Grade at Alternative Schools, 1989-90

Peer Leadership Alternative High Schools	Number of Students By Grade					
	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Total
North Avenue Academy						
Advisees	0	28	16	12	14	70
Peer Leaders	0	0	1	7	4	12
Total	0	0	17	19	18	82
Rich's Academy						
Advisees	0	30	27	21	13	91
Peer Leaders	0	3	4	3	2	12
Total	0	33	31	24	15	103
West End Academy						
Advisees	0	13	17	14	6	50
Peer Leaders	0	5	7	1	1	14
Total	0	18	24	15	7	64
Peer Leadership Total Alternative High						
Advisees	0	71	60	47	33	211
Peer Leaders	0	8	12	11	7	38
Total	0	79	72	58	40	249

Control Alternative High Schools	Number of Students By Grade					
	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Total
Central Academy						
Advisees	0	48	32	14	0	94
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	6	6
Total	0	48	32	14	0	100
St. Luke's Academy						
Advisees	0	54	37	24	11	126
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	10	10
Total	0	54	37	24	21	136
Control Total Alternative High						
Advisees	0	102	69	38	11	220
Peer Leaders	0	0	0	0	16	16
Total	0	102	69	38	27	236

TABLE 3 -- ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION

Comparison of Student Attendance for Program Participants and a Control Group at Regular High Schools, 1989-90

Peer Leadership Regular High Schools	Total Number of Students	Students Absent															
		First Semester (1st through 5th Attendance Periods)								Second Semester (6th through 9th Attendance Periods)							
		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Archer High																	
Advisees	80	11	14	26	33	16	20	27	34	9	11	21	26	21	26	29	36
Peer Leaders	16	0	0	6	38	7	44	3	19	0	0	3	19	6	38	7	44
Total	96	11	11	32	33	23	24	30	31	9	9	24	25	27	28	36	38
Douglass High																	
Advisees	39	7	18	19	49	6	15	7	18	8	21	16	41	6	15	9	23
Peer Leaders	20	5	25	11	55	2	10	2	10	4	20	9	45	4	20	3	15
Total	59	12	20	30	51	8	14	9	15	12	20	25	42	10	17	12	20
Turner High School																	
Advisees	49	14	29	17	35	6	12	12	24	11	22	15	31	9	18	14	29
Peer Leaders	16	1	6	7	44	5	31	3	19	1	6	2	13	9	56	4	28
Total	65	15	23	24	37	11	17	15	23	12	18	17	26	18	28	18	28
West Fulton High																	
Advisees	119	18	15	39	33	28	24	34	29	19	16	48	40	18	15	34	29
Peer Leaders	12	1	8	6	50	3	25	2	17	0	0	5	42	4	33	3	25
Total	131	19	15	45	34	31	24	36	27	19	15	53	40	22	17	37	28
Peer Leadership Total Regular High																	
Advisees	287	50	17	101	35	56	20	80	28	47	16	100	35	54	19	86	30
Peer Leaders	64	7	11	30	47	17	26	10	16	5	8	19	30	23	36	17	26
Total	351	57	16	131	37	73	21	90	26	52	15	119	34	77	22	103	29

Control Regular High Schools	Total Number of Students	Students Absent															
		First Semester (1st through 5th Attendance Periods)								Second Semester (6th through 9th Attendance Periods)							
		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Harper High																	
Control Advisees	217	44	20	78	36	31	14	64	29	48	22	72	33	41	19	56	26
Control Peer Leaders	16	3	19	5	31	3	19	5	31	3	19	6	38	3	19	4	25
Total	233	47	20	83	36	34	15	69	30	51	22	78	33	44	19	60	26
Washington High																	
Control Advisees	161	33	20	34	21	25	16	69	43	20	12	34	21	24	15	83	52
Control Peer Leaders	16	4	25	6	38	2	13	4	25	2	13	5	31	2	13	7	44
Total	177	37	21	40	23	27	15	73	41	22	12	39	22	26	15	90	51
Control Total Regular High																	
Control Advisees	378	77	20	112	30	56	15	133	35	68	18	106	28	65	17	139	37
Control Peer Leaders	32	7	22	11	34	5	16	9	28	5	16	11	34	5	16	11	34
Total	410	84	20	123	30	61	15	142	35	73	18	117	29	70	17	150	37

TABLE 4
ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION
Comparison of Student Attendance for Program Participants and a Control Group at Alternative High Schools, 1989-90

Peer Leadership Alternative High Schools	Total Number of Students	Students Absent															
		First Semester (1st through 5th Attendance Periods)								Second Semester (6th through 9th Attendance Periods)							
		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
North Avenue Academy																	
Advisees	70	5	7	8	11	6	9	51	73	8	11	2	3	3	4	57	81
Peer Leaders	12	1	8	2	17	5	42	4	33	0	0	2	17	2	17	8	67
Total	82	6	7	10	12	11	13	55	67	8	10	4	5	5	6	65	79
Rich's Academy																	
Advisees	91	13	14	17	19	13	14	48	53	19	21	16	18	22	24	34	37
Peer Leaders	12	1	8	7	58	2	17	2	17	1	8	5	42	5	42	1	8
Total	103	14	14	24	23	15	15	50	49	20	19	21	20	27	26	35	34
West End Academy																	
Advisees	50	1	2	0	0	0	0	49	98	12	24	0	0	2	4	36	72
Peer Leaders	14	0	0	1	7	2	14	11	79	0	0	2	14	1	7	11	79
Total	64	1	2	1	2	2	3	60	94	12	19	2	3	3	5	47	73
Peer Leadership Total Alternative High																	
Advisees	211	19	9	25	12	19	9	148	70	39	18	18	9	27	13	127	60
Peer Leaders	38	2	5	10	26	9	24	17	45	1	3	9	24	8	21	20	53
Total	249	21	8	35	14	28	11	165	66	40	16	27	11	35	14	147	59

Control Alternative High Schools	Total Number of Students	Students Absent															
		First Semester (1st through 5th Attendance Periods)								Second Semester (6th through 9th Attendance Periods)							
		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days		0 Days		1-5 Days		6-10 Days		11 + Days	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Central Academy																	
Control Advisees	94	25	27	4	4	9	10	56	60	21	22	9	10	3	3	61	65
Control Peer Leaders	6	2	33	0	0	0	0	4	67	1	17	1	17	1	17	3	50
Total	100	27	27	4	4	9	9	60	60	22	22	10	10	4	4	64	64
St. Luke's Academy																	
Control Advisees	126	31	25	12	10	18	14	65	52	37	29	26	21	25	20	38	30
Control Peer Leaders	10	1	10	0	0	1	10	8	80	6	60	1	10	1	10	2	20
Total	136	32	24	12	9	19	14	73	54	43	32	27	20	26	19	40	29
Control Total Alternative High																	
Control Advisees	220	56	25	16	7	27	12	121	55	58	26	35	16	28	13	99	45
Control Peer Leaders	16	3	19	0	0	1	6	12	75	7	44	2	13	2	13	5	31
Total	236	59	25	16	7	28	12	133	56	65	28	37	16	30	13	104	44

R&E:LB:jep 12/90 #4918

TABLE 5
ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION
Comparison of Number of Courses Failed for Program Participants and a Control Group at Regular High Schools, 1989-90

Peer Leadership Regular High Schools	Students Failing													
	Total Number of Students on Grade File	First Semester						Total Number of Students on Grade File	Second Semester					
		No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses			No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
Archer High														
Advisees	80	54	68	12	15	14	18	77	51	66	13	17	13	17
Peer Leaders	16	14	88	2	13	0	0	16	16	100	0	0	0	0
Total	98	68	71	14	15	14	15	93	67	72	13	14	13	14
Douglass High														
Advisees	39	28	72	7	18	4	10	39	22	56	13	33	4	10
Peer Leaders	20	18	90	1	5	1	5	20	19	95	1	5	0	0
Total	59	46	78	8	14	5	8	59	41	69	14	24	4	7
Turner High														
Advisees	48	25	52	13	27	10	21	46	27	59	7	15	12	26
Peer Leaders	16	10	63	6	38	0	0	16	13	81	2	13	1	6
Total	64	35	55	19	30	10	16	62	40	65	9	15	13	21
West Fulton High														
Advisees	115	61	53	14	12	40	35	106	57	54	23	22	26	25
Peer Leaders	12	10	83	2	17	0	0	12	11	92	1	8	0	0
Total	127	71	56	16	13	40	31	118	68	58	24	20	26	22
Peer Leadership Total Regular High														
Advisees	282	168	60	46	16	68	24	268	157	59	56	21	55	21
Peer Leaders	64	52	81	11	17	1	2	64	59	92	4	6	1	2
Total	346	220	64	57	16	69	20	332	216	65	60	18	56	17

Control Regular High Schools	Students Failing													
	Total Number of Students on Grade File	First Semester						Total Number of Students on Grade File	Second Semester					
		No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses			No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
Harper High														
Advisees	187	103	55	33	18	51	27	185	100	54	29	16	56	30
Peer Leaders	15	13	87	0	0	2	13	13	9	69	3	23	1	8
Total	202	116	57	33	16	53	26	198	109	55	32	16	57	29
Washington High														
Advisees	141	76	54	17	12	48	34	151	75	50	10	7	66	44
Peer Leaders	16	10	63	3	19	3	19	16	12	75	1	6	3	19
Total	157	86	55	20	13	51	32	167	87	52	11	7	69	41
Control Total Regular High														
Advisees	328	179	55	50	15	99	30	336	175	52	39	12	122	36
Peer Leaders	31	23	74	3	10	5	16	29	21	72	4	14	4	14
Total	359	202	56	53	15	104	29	365	196	54	43	12	126	35

R&E LB jep 12/90 #4918

TABLE 6
ATLANTA PEER LEADERSHIP CONNECTION
Comparison of Number of Courses Failed for Program Participants and a Control Group at Alternative High Schools, 1989-90

Peer Leadership Alternative High Schools	Students Failing													
	Total Number of Students on Grade File	First Semester						Total Number of Students on Grade File	Second Semester					
		No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses			No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
North Avenue Academy														
Advisees	65	26	40	8	12	31	48	57	17	30	5	9	35	61
Peer Leaders	11	10	91	1	9	0	0	11	9	82	1	9	1	9
Total	76	36	47	9	12	31	41	68	26	38	6	9	36	53
Rich's Academy														
Advisees	91	19	21	13	14	59	65	66	22	33	3	5	41	62
Peer Leaders	12	4	33	2	17	6	50	11	5	45	0	0	6	55
Total	103	23	22	15	15	65	63	77	27	35	3	4	47	61
West End Academy														
Advisees	41	7	17	9	22	25	61	26	8	31	6	23	12	46
Peer Leaders	14	8	57	4	29	2	14	12	5	42	3	25	4	33
Total	55	15	27	13	24	27	49	38	13	34	9	24	16	42
Peer Leadership Total Alternative High														
Advisees	197	52	26	30	15	115	58	149	47	32	14	9	88	59
Peer Leaders	37	22	59	7	19	8	22	34	19	56	4	12	11	32
Total	234	74	32	37	16	123	53	183	66	36	18	10	99	54

Control Alternative High Schools	Students Failing													
	Total Number of Students on Grade File	First Semester						Total Number of Students on Grade File	Second Semester					
		No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses			No Courses		One Course		Two + Courses	
		N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%
Central Academy														
Control Advisees	71	25	35	8	11	38	54	54	16	30	13	24	25	46
Control Peer Leaders	6	4	67	0	0	2	33	5	5	100	0	0	0	0
Total	77	29	38	8	10	40	52	59	21	36	13	22	25	42
St. Luke's Academy														
Control Advisees	83	48	58	6	7	29	35	90	59	66	15	17	16	18
Control Peer Leaders	9	7	78	0	0	2	22	8	8	100	0	0	0	0
Total	92	55	60	6	7	31	34	98	67	68	15	15	16	16
Control Total Alternative High														
Control Advisees	154	73	47	14	9	67	44	144	75	52	28	19	41	28
Control Peer Leaders	15	11	73	0	0	4	27	13	13	100	0	0	0	0
Total	169	84	50	14	8	71	42	157	88	56	28	18	41	26

R&E/LB jep 12/90 #4918